arXiv:1510.00811v1 [math.CO] 3 Oct 2015

Decomposition of Graphs into (k, r)-Fans and Single Edges *

Xinmin Hou[a], Yu Qiu[b], Boyuan Liu[c]

[a,b,c] Key Laboratory of Wu Wen-Tsun Mathematics

Chinese Academy of Sciences

School of Mathematical Sciences

University of Science and Technology of China

Hefei, Anhui 230026, China.

[a]xmhou@ustc.edu.cn, [b]yuqiu@mail.ustc.edu.cn

[c]lby1055@mail.ustc.edu.cn

Abstract

Let $\phi(n, H)$ be the largest integer such that, for all graphs G on n vertices, the edge set $E(G)$ can be partitioned into at most $\phi(n, H)$ parts, of which every part either is a single edge or forms a graph isomorphic to H. Pikhurko and Sousa conjectured that $\phi(n, H) = \mathrm{ex}(n, H)$ for $\chi(H) \geqslant 3$ and all sufficiently large n, where $\mathrm{ex}(n, H)$ denotes the maximum number of edges of graphs on n vertices that does not contain H as a subgraph. A (k, r)-fan is a graph on $(r-1)k+1$ vertices consisting of k cliques of order r which intersect in exactly one common vertex. In this paper, we verify Pikhurko and Sousa's conjecture for (k, r)-fans. The result also generalizes a result of Liu and Sousa.

1 Introduction

All graphs considered in this paper are simple and finite. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a vertex $x \in V(G)$, the number of neighbors of x in G, denoted by $\deg_G(x)$, is

*The work was supported by NNSF of China (No. 11271348).

called the *degree* of x in G. The number of edges of G is denoted by $e(G)$. A *matching* in G is a subgraph of G such that each of its vertices has degree 1. The *matching number* of G is the maximum number of edges in a matching of G, denoted by $\nu(G)$. As usual, we use $\delta(G), \Delta(G)$ and $\chi(G)$ to denote the minimum degree, maximum degree, and chromatic number of G, respectively. For a graph G and $S, T \subset V(G)$, let $e_G(S,T)$ be the number of edges $e = xy \in E(G)$ such that $x \in S$ and $y \in T$, if $S = T$, we use $e_G(S)$ instead of $e_G(S,S)$; and we use $e_G(u,T)$ instead of $e_G(\{u\},T)$ for convenience, the index G will be omitted if no confusion from the context. For a subset $X \subseteq V(G)$ or $X \subseteq E(G)$, let $G[S]$ be the subgraph of G induced by X, that is $G[X] = (X, E(X))$ if $X \subseteq V(G)$, or $G[X] = (V(X), X)$ if $X \subseteq E(G)$. For two integers a, b with $a \leq b$, let $[a,b] = \{a, a+1, \cdots, b\}$.

Let K_r denote the complete graph of order r and let $T_{n,r}$ denote the complete balanced r-partite graph of order n, also called the *Turán graph* in literature. For $k \geqslant 2$ and $r \geqslant 3$, a (k,r)-*fan*, denoted by $F_{k,r}$, is the graph on $(r-1)k+1$ vertices consisting of k K_r's which intersect in exactly one common vertex, called the center of it. For some fixed graph H, let $\mathrm{ex}(n,H)$ be the maximum number of edges of graphs on n vertices that does not contain H as a subgraph. A graph G is called an *extremal graph for* H if G has n vertices with $e(G) = \mathrm{ex}(n,H)$ and does not contain H as a subgraph. Given two graphs G and H, an H-*decomposition* of G is a partition of edges of G such that every part is a single edge or forms a graph isomorphic to H. Let $\phi(G,H)$ be the smallest number of parts in an H-decomposition of G. Clearly, if H is non-empty, then

$$\phi(G,H) = e(G) - p_H(G)(e(H)-1),$$

where $p_H(G)$ is the maximum number of edge-disjoint copies of H in G. Define

$$\phi(n,H) = \max\{\phi(G,H) : \ G \text{ is a graph on } n \text{ vertices}\}.$$

This function, motivated by the problem of representing graphs by set intersections, was first studied by Erdös, Goodman and Pósa [5], they proved that $\phi(n,K_3) = \mathrm{ex}(n,K_3)$. The result was generalized by Bollobás [2], he proved that $\phi(n,K_r) = \mathrm{ex}(n,K_r)$, for all $n \geqslant r \geqslant 3$. More generally, Pikhurko and Sousa [8] proposed the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1 ([8]). *For any graph H with $\chi(H) \geqslant 3$, there is an $n_0 = n_0(H)$ such that $\phi(n,H) = \mathrm{ex}(n,H)$ for all $n \geqslant n_0$.*

In [8], Pikhurko and Sousa also proved that $\phi(n,H) = \mathrm{ex}(n,H) + o(n^2)$. Recently, the error term improved to be $O(n^{2-\alpha})$ for some $\alpha > 0$ by Allen, Böttcher, and Person [1]. Sousa verified the conjecture for some families of edge-critical graphs, namely, clique-extensions of order $r \geqslant 4$ ($n \geqslant r$) [11] and the cycles of length 5 ($n \geqslant 6$) [9] and 7 ($n \geqslant 10$) [10]. In [7], Özkahya and Person verified the conjecture for all edge-critical graphs with chromatic number $r \geqslant 3$. Here, a graph H is called *edge-critical*, if there is an edge $e \in E(H)$, such that $\chi(H) > \chi(H-e)$. For non-edge-critical graphs, Liu and Sousa [6] verified the conjecture for $(k,3)$-fans, there result is as the following.

Theorem 2 ([6])**.** *For $k \geqslant 1$, there exists $n_0 = n_0(k,r)$ such that $\phi(n, F_{k,3}) = \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,3})$ for all $n \geqslant n_0$. Moreover, the only graphs attaining $\mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,3})$ are the extremal graphs for $F_{k,3}$.*

In this paper, we verify Conjecture 1 for (k,r)-fans for $k \geq 2$ and $r \geq 3$ and hence generalizes Theorem 2. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 3. *For $k \geqslant 2$ and $r \geqslant 3$, there exists $n_1 = n_1(k,r)$ such that $\phi(n, F_{k,r}) = \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r})$ for all $n \geqslant n_0$. Moreover, the only graphs attaining $\mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r})$ are the extremal graphs for $F_{k,r}$.*

The remaining of the paper is arranged as follows. Section 2 gives some lemmas. The proof of Theorem 3 is given in Section 3.

2 Lemmas

The extremal graphs for $F_{k,r}$ was determined by Chen, Gould, Pfender and Wei [4].

Lemma 4 (Theorem 2 in [4])**.** *For every $k \geqslant 1$ and $r \geqslant 2$ and every $n \geqslant 16k^3r^8$, $\mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r}) = \mathrm{ex}(n, K_r) + g(k)$, where*

$$g(k) = \begin{cases} k^2 - k & if\ k\ is\ odd, \\ k^2 - \dfrac{3}{2}k & if\ k\ is\ even. \end{cases}$$

And one of its extremal graphs, denoted by $G_{n,k,r}$, constructed as follows. If k is odd, $G_{n,k,r}$ is a Turán graph $T_{n,r-1}$ with two vertex disjoint copies of K_k embedding in one partite set. If k is even, $G_{n,k,r}$ is a Turán graph $T_{n,r-1}$ with a graph on $2k-1$ vertices, $k^2 - \frac{3}{2}k$ edges, and maximum degree $k-1$ embedded in one partite set.

Lemma 5. *Let G be an extremal graph on n vertices for $F_{k,r}$. Then $\delta(G) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{r-2}{r-1}n \right\rfloor$.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that there is a vertex $v \in V(G)$ with $\deg_G(v) < \left\lfloor \frac{r-2}{r-1}n \right\rfloor = \delta(T_{n,r-1})$. Let $G' = G - v$. Then

$$e(G') \geqslant e(G) - \deg_G(v) \geq \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r}) - \delta(T_{n,r-1}) + 1 = \mathrm{ex}(n-1, F_{k,r}) + 1$$

since $\mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r}) - \mathrm{ex}(n-1, F_{k,r}) = \delta(T_{n,r-1})$. By Lemma 4, G' (and hence G) contains a copy of $F_{k,r}$ as its subgraph, a contradiction. □

Lemma 6. *Let n_0 be an integer and let G be a graph on $n \geq n_0 + \binom{n_0}{2}$ vertices with $\phi(G, F_{k,r}) = \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r}) + j$ for some integer $j > 0$. Then G contains a subgraph G' on $n' > n_0$ vertices such that $\delta(G') \geqslant \delta(T_{n-i,r-1})$ and $\phi(G', F_{k,r}) \geqslant \mathrm{ex}(n-i, F_{k,r}) + j + i$.*

Proof. If $\delta(G) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor$, then G is the desired graph and we have nothing to do. So assume that $\delta(G) < \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor$. Let $v \in V(G)$ with $\deg_G(v) < \left\lfloor \frac{r-2}{r-1}n \right\rfloor$ and set $G_1 = G - v$. Then $\phi(G_1, F_{k,r}) \geqslant \phi(G, F_{k,r}) - \deg_G(v) \geqslant \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r}) + j - \delta(T_{n,r-1}) + 1 = \mathrm{ex}(n-1, F_{k,r}) + j + 1$, since $\mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r}) - \mathrm{ex}(n-1, F_{k,r}) = \delta(T_{n,r-1})$ by Lemma 4. We may continue this procedure until we get a graph G' on $n - i$ vertices with $\delta(G') \geqslant \left\lfloor \frac{r-2}{r-1}(n-i) \right\rfloor$ for some $i < n - n_0$, or until $i = n - n_0$. But the latter case can not occur since G' is a graph on n_0 vertices but $e(G') \geqslant \mathrm{ex}(n_0, F_{k,r}) + j + i \geqslant n - n_0 > \binom{n_0}{2}$, which is impossible. □

The following stability lemma due to Özkahya and Person [7] is very important.

Lemma 7 ([7])**.** *Let H be a graph with $\chi(H) = r \geqslant 3$ and $H \neq K_r$. Then, for every $\gamma > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ and $n_0 = n_0(H, \gamma) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every graph G on $n \geqslant n_0$ vertices with $\phi(G, H) \geqslant \mathrm{ex}(n, H) - \delta n^2$, then there exists a partition of $V(G) = V_1 \dot\cup ... \dot\cup V_{r-1}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} e(V_i) < \gamma n^2$.*

Lemma 8 ([3])**.** *For any graph G with maximum degree $\Delta \geqslant 1$ and matching number $\nu \geqslant 1$, then $e(G) \leqslant f(\nu, \Delta)$. Here, $f(\nu, \Delta) = \nu\Delta + \left\lfloor \frac{\Delta}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{\nu}{\lceil \Delta/2 \rceil} \right\rfloor$.*

3 Proof of Theorem 3

The lower bound $\phi(n, H) \geqslant \mathrm{ex}(n, H)$ is trivial by the definition of $\phi(n, H)$ and $\mathrm{ex}(n, H)$. To prove Theorem 3, it is sufficient to prove that $\phi(n, F_{k,r}) \leqslant \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r})$ and the equality holds only for extremal graphs for $F_{k,r}$. Our proof is motivated by

the one in [6]. In outline, for every graph G with $\phi(G, F_{k,r}) \geqslant \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r})$ and G is not an extremal graph for $F_{k,r}$, we will find sufficiently many edge-disjoint copies of $F_{k,r}$ in G which would imply that $\phi(G, F_{k,r}) = e(G) - p_{F_{k,r}}(G)(e(F_{k,r}) - 1) < \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r})$, a contradiction. In other words, we will prove that

$$p_{F_{k,r}}(G) > \frac{e(G) - \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r})}{e(F_{k,r}) - 1}.$$

For convenience, we set some constants as follows.

$\gamma = (40kr^4)^{-2}$,

$n_0 = n_0(F_{k,r}, \gamma)$ (which is determined by $F_{k,r}$ and γ by applying Lemma 7),

$\alpha = \sqrt{1 - \dfrac{r-1}{r-2}\gamma}$,

$m_1 = m_1(k, r) = \dfrac{(e(F_{k,r}) - 1)(r-1)k(k-1) - kg(k)}{e(F_{k,r}) - 1 - k}$,

$m_2 = m_2(k, r) = \dfrac{(e(F_{k,r}) - 1)(r-1)k(k-1) - kg(k)}{(e(F_{k,r}) - 1)/2 - k}$,

$n_1 = n_1(k, r) = 1 + \max\{\left\lceil \dfrac{r-1}{\alpha} \right\rceil, n_0 + \binom{n_0}{2}, 16(k+1)^3 r^8 + 6(k+1)^2 r^3 m_1\}$.

Now suppose that G is a graph on $n > n_1$ vertices, with $\phi(G, F_{k,r}) \geqslant \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r})$ and G is not an extremal graph for $F_{k,r}$. Then $e(G) > \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r})$. By Lemma 6, we may assume that $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor \frac{r-2}{r-1} n \rfloor$. Note that $\chi(F_{k,r}) = r$. Let $V_1, ..., V_{r-1}$ be a partition of $V(G)$ such that $\sum_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant r-1} e(V_i, V_j)$ is maximized. Let $m = \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} e(V_i)$. By Lemma 7 and the choice of the partition of $V(G)$, we have $m < \gamma n^2$. By Lemma 4, observe that

$$m = e(G) - \sum_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant r-1} e(V_i, V_j) > \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r}) - e(T_{n,r-1}) = g(k),$$

and that

$$e(G) = m + \sum_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant r-1} e(V_i, V_j) \leqslant m + e(T_{r-1,n}) = \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r}) + m - g(k).$$

So to prove Theorem 3, it suffices to show that

$$p_{F_{k,r}}(G) > \frac{m - g(k)}{e(F_{k,r}) - 1} \ (\geq \frac{e(G) - \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r})}{e(F_{k,r}) - 1}).$$

The following claim asserts that the partition $V(G) = V_1 \dot\cup V_2 \dot\cup \cdots \dot\cup V_{r-1}$ is very close to balance.

Claim 1. *For every* $i \in [1, r-1]$, $||V_i| - \frac{n}{r-1}| \leqslant 2\sqrt{\gamma}n$.

Proof. Let $a = \max\{\big||V_j| - \frac{n}{r-1}\big|,\ j \in [1, r-1]$. Wlog, suppose that $|V_1| - \frac{n}{r-1} = a$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
e(G) &= \sum_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant r-1} e(V_i, V_j) + m \\
&\leqslant \sum_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant r-1} |V_i||V_j| + m \\
&= |V_1|(n - |V_1|) + \sum_{2\leqslant i<j\leqslant r-1} |V_i||V_j| + m \\
&= |V_1|(n - |V_1|) + \frac{1}{2}\left[\left(\sum_{j=2}^{r-1} |V_j|\right)^2 - \sum_{j=2}^{r-1} |V_j|^2\right] + m \\
&\leqslant |V_1|(n - |V_1|) + \frac{1}{2}(n - |V_1|)^2 - \frac{1}{2(r-2)}(n - |V_1|)^2 + m \\
&< -\frac{r-1}{2(r-2)}a^2 + \frac{r-2}{2(r-1)}n^2 + \gamma n^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The fifth inequality holds by Jensen's inequality and the last inequality holds since $|V_1| = a + \frac{n}{r-1}$, and $m < \gamma n^2$.

While on the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
e(G) &> ex(n, F_{k,r}) > e(T_{n,r-1}) \\
&\geqslant \binom{r-1}{2}\left(\frac{n}{r-1} - 1\right)^2 \\
&\geqslant \binom{r-1}{2}(\frac{\alpha n}{r-1})^2 \\
&= \frac{r-2}{2(r-1)}n^2\alpha^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{r-1}{2(r-2)}a^2 < \left[\frac{r-2}{2(r-1)}(1-\alpha^2) + \gamma\right] n^2 < 2\gamma n^2,$$

which implies that $a < \sqrt{\frac{4(r-2)}{r-1}\gamma}n < 2\sqrt{\gamma}n$. □

Recall that our purpose is to find more than $(m - g(k))/(e(F_{k,r}) - 1)$ edge-disjoint copies of $F_{k,r}$. We continue the proof by considering two different cases.

Case 1. $m > m_1$.

Set $t_1 = \frac{n}{16kr^3}$ and

$$t_2 = \frac{n}{r-1} - 2(r-3)\sqrt{\gamma}n - 2t_1 - 2.$$

For $v \in V_i$ ($i \in [1, r-1]$), we say that v is *bad* if $\deg_{G[V_i]}(v) > t_1$, otherwise v is said to be *good*. For each bad vertex $v \in V_i$, choose $k\lceil \deg_{G[V_i]}(v)/2k \rceil$ edges which connect v to good vertices in V_i. We keep these edges and delete other edges in $G[V_i]$ at v. We repeat this procedure to every bad vertex in G and denote the resulting graph by G_0. This is possible since the number of bad vertices in G is at most

$$\frac{2m}{t_1} < \frac{2\gamma n^2}{t_1} = 32kr^3\gamma n < \frac{t_1}{2}.$$

Next we will find copies of $F_{k,r}$ in G_0. Each time we find a copy of $F_{k,r}$, we delete the edges of $F_{k,r}$, and let G_s denote the graph obtained from G_0 after deleting the edges of s copies of $F_{k,r}$. For a vertex $v \in V_i$ in G_s, we say that v is *active* (in G_s) if $e_{G_s}(v, V_j) > t_2$ for every $j \neq i$, otherwise v is said to be *inactive*.

We have the following two claims about G_0.

Claim 2.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} e_{G_0}(V_i) \geqslant \frac{m}{2}.$$

Proof. For every i, let $U_i \subset V_i$ be the set of good vertices in V_i. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
e_{G_0}(V_i) &= e_{G_0}(U_i) + \sum_{\substack{v \in V_i \\ v \text{ is bad}}} \deg_{G_0[V_i]}(v) \\
&= e_G(U_i) + \sum_{\substack{v \in V_i \\ v \text{ is bad}}} k\left\lceil \frac{1}{2k}\deg_{G[V_i]}(v) \right\rceil \\
&\geqslant \frac{1}{2}e_G(U_i) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{v \in V_i \\ v \text{ is bad}}} \deg_{G[V_i]}(v) \\
&\geqslant \frac{1}{2}e_G(V_i).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Claim 3. *All of good vertices are active in G_0.*

Proof. Let $v \in V_i$ be a good vertex. Then for every $j \neq i$, by Claim 1 and Lemma 6,

$$\begin{aligned} e_{G_0}(v, V_j) &\geqslant \delta(G) - \deg_{G_0[V_i]}(v) - (r-3)(\frac{n}{r-1} + 2\sqrt{\gamma}n) \\ &\geq \delta(T_{n,r-1}) - \deg_{G[V_i]}(v) - (r-3)(\frac{n}{r-1} + 2\sqrt{\gamma}n) \\ &\geqslant \frac{n}{r-1} - 2(r-3)\sqrt{\gamma}n - t_1 - 1 \\ &\geqslant t_2 + t_1. \end{aligned}$$

□

The following two steps are the procedures to find edge-disjoint copies of $F_{k,r}$.

Step 1. Suppose that we have gotten G_s for some integer $s \geqslant 0$. If there exists a vertex $u \in V_i$ with $\deg_{G_s[V_i]}(u) \geqslant k$ (bad vertices are considered first, followed by good vertices), let $v_i^1, ...v_i^k$ be k neighbors of u in V_i, then for every $j \neq i$ we find k good and active vertices $v_j^1, ..., v_j^k \in V_j$ such that for every $\ell \in [1,k]$, $G_s[u, v_1^\ell, ..., v_{r-1}^\ell]$ is a copy of K_r, and thus $G_s[\{u\} \cup \{v_j^\ell : \ell \in [1,k], j \in [1,r-1]\}]$ contains a copy of $F_{k,r}$ centered at u. Let G_{s+1} be the updated new graph obtained from G_s by deleting the edges of this $F_{k,r}$.

Step 2. After Step 1 is completed, denote the remaining graph by G_a. Then $\Delta(G_a[V_i]) < k$ for each $i \in [1, r-1]$, and $\deg_{G_a[V_i]}(u) = 0$ for all bad vertices $u \in V_i$ since $\deg_{G_0[V_i]}(u)$ is a multiple of k. Suppose that we have get G_s for some $s \geqslant a$. If there is a matching of order k in $G_s[V_i]$ for some $i \in [1, r-1]$, for example, let $v_1^1 w_1^1, ..., v_1^k w_1^k \in V_1$ be such a matching. We find good and active vertices $u \in V_2$ and $v_j^1, ..., v_j^k$ in V_j for every $j \in [3, r-1]$ such that $G_s[v_1^\ell, w_1^\ell, u, v_3^\ell, \cdots, v_{r-1}^\ell]$ is a copy of K_r for each $\ell \in [1,k]$ and so $G_s[\{u\} \cup \{v_1^\ell, w_1^\ell, v_j^\ell : j \in [3, r-1], \ell \in [1,k]\}]$ contains a copy of $F_{k,r}$ centered at u. Let G_{s+1} be the updated new graph obtained from G_s by deleting the edges of $F_{k,r}$. When Step 2 is completed, denote the remaining graph by G_b.

Note that after Step 1 and 2 are finished, we have found at least

$$\left\lfloor \frac{1}{k} \left(\sum_i e_{G_0}(V_i) - \sum_i e_{G_b}(V_i)) \right) \right\rfloor$$

edge-disjoint $F_{k,r}$ from G since each copy of $F_{k,r}$ using exactly k edges from $\cup_{i=1}^{r-1} E(G[V_i])$. Since $\Delta(G_b[V_i]) \leq k-1$ and $\nu(G_b[V_i]) \leq k-1$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, r-1$, by Lemma 8,

$$e_{G_b}(V_i) \leqslant f(k-1, k-1) \leqslant k(k-1),$$

which implies that $\sum_i e_{G_b}(V_i) \leqslant (r-1)k(k-1)$. Let p be the the number of removed edge-disjoint $F_{k,r}$ from G.

If $m > m_2(k,r)$ $(> m_1)$, then, since $\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} e_{G_0}(V_i) \geqslant \frac{m}{2}$, we have

$$p_{F_{k,r}}(G) \geq p \geqslant \frac{1}{k}\left[\frac{m}{2} - (r-1)k(k-1)\right] > \frac{m-g(k)}{e(F_{k,r})-1}.$$

If $m_1 < m \leqslant m_2(k,r)$, then for every vertex $u \in V_i$, $\deg_{G[V_i]}(u) \leqslant m \leqslant m_2(k,r) < t_1$ and hence u is good. That is G has no bad vertices and so $G_0 = G$. Therefore,

$$p_{F_{k,r}}(G) \geq p \geqslant \frac{1}{k}\left[m - (r-1)k(k-1)\right] > \frac{m-g(k)}{e(F_{k,r})-1}.$$

Therefore, to complete the proof of Case 1, it remains to prove the following claim.

Claim 4. *Step 1 and 2 can be successfully iterated.*

To proof the above claim, we first estimate the number of good and inactive vertices in each iteration of Step 1 or 2.

Claim 5. *Let $G_s \subset G_0$ be a subgraph at some point of the iteration in Step 1 or Step 2. Then the number of good inactive vertices in G_s is at most $8kr^5\gamma n$.*

Proof. Since in each iteration of Step 1 or Step 2, the number of removed edges with both endpoints in V_i is exactly k, $s \leqslant m/k < \gamma n^2/k$. So the total number of deleted edges from G_0 is at most $e(F_{k,r}) \cdot s < \frac{r(r-1)}{2}\gamma n^2$. By Claim 3, for every good vertex $u \in V_i$, u is active in G_0 and $e_{G_0}(v, V_j) \geqslant t_2 + t_1$. Thus the number of good vertices that are inactive in G_s is at most $\frac{e(F_{k,r})\cdot s}{t_1} < 8kr^5\gamma n$. □

Proof of Claim 4: Let G_s be the graph obtained at some point of the iteration in Step 1. For any fixed $x \in V_i$ and every $j \neq i$. If x is bad and is involved in a previous iterate, then x is the center of a copy of $F_{k,r}$ and hence the number of removed edges that x sends to V_j is k. Since x involves at most $\frac{\deg_{G_0[V_i]}(x)}{k}$ iterates,

$$\begin{aligned}
e_{G_s}(x, V_j) &\geqslant e_{G_0}(x, V_j) - k \cdot \frac{\deg_{G_0[V_i]}(x)}{k} \\
&= e_G(x, V_j) - k\left\lceil \frac{\deg_{G[V_i]}(x)}{2k} \right\rceil \\
&\geqslant \frac{e_G(x, V_j)}{2} - k \\
&\geqslant \frac{n}{4(r-1)} - \frac{r-3}{2}\sqrt{\gamma}n - \frac{1}{4} - k \\
&\geq \frac{t_2}{4} + \frac{t_1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} - k,
\end{aligned}$$

the third inequality holds since

$$e_G(x, V_j) \geq \deg_{G[V_i]}(x) \tag{1}$$

((1) holds because of the maximality of $\sum_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant r-1} e(V_i, V_j)$); the forth inequality holds since

$$\begin{aligned} e_G(x, V_j) &= \deg_G(x) - \deg_{G[V_i]}(x) - \sum_{\ell \neq i,j} e_G(x, V_\ell) \\ &\geq \delta(G) - \deg_{G[V_i]}(x) - (r-3)(\frac{n}{r-1} + 2\sqrt{\gamma}n) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

and ((1) and (2) implies that)

$$\begin{aligned} e_G(x, V_j) &\geqslant \frac{1}{2}[\delta(G) - (r-3)(\frac{n}{r-1} + 2\sqrt{\gamma}n)] \\ &\geq \frac{n}{2(r-1)} - (r-3)\sqrt{\gamma}n - \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

If x is good and active in G_s, then $e_{G_s}(x, V_j) \geq t_2$. Now suppose x is good but inactive in G_s. Then x becomes inactive in a previous iterate. If x is involved in a succeeding iterate, then x is chosen to be the center of a copy of $F_{k,r}$. So the number of edges that x sends to V_j is k and x is involved in at most $\frac{\deg_{G_0[V_i]}(x)}{k}$ succeeding iterates. Hence, by inequality (2) and $\deg_{G[V_i]}(x) \leq t_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} e_{G_s}(x, V_j) &\geqslant t_2 - k - \deg_{G_0[V_i]}(x) \\ &\geq t_2 - t_1 - k \\ (\ &\geq \frac{t_2}{4} + \frac{t_1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} - k \ \text{ when } n \text{ is sufficiently large}). \end{aligned}$$

Wlog, let u be in V_1 and $v_1^1, ..., v_1^k \in V_1$ are k (good) neighbors of u. Suppose that for some $\ell \in [1, r-2]$, we have found good and active vertices $v_i^1, ..., v_i^k \in V_i$ $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant l)$ such that for every $j \in [1, k]$, $G_s[u, v_1^j, ..., v_\ell^j]$ is a copy of $K_{\ell+1}$. Then, for every $j \in [1, k]$, by Claim 5, the number of good and active common neighbors of

$u, v_1^j, ..., v_\ell^j$ in $V_{\ell+1}$ of G_s, denoted by $L_{\ell+1}(u, v_1^j, ..., v_\ell^j)$, is

$$\begin{aligned}
|L_{\ell+1}(u, v_1^j, ..., v_\ell^j)| &\geq e_{G_s}(u, V_{\ell+1}) + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} e_{G_s}(v_i^j, V_{\ell+1}) - \ell|V_{\ell+1}| \\
&\quad -32kr^3\gamma n - 8kr^5\gamma n \\
&\geq \frac{t_2}{4} + \frac{t_1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} - k + \ell(t_2 - t_1 - k) \\
&\quad -\ell(\frac{n}{r-1} + 2\sqrt{\gamma}n) - 32kr^3\gamma n - 8kr^5\gamma n \\
&\geqslant \frac{n}{4(r-1)} - \frac{13n}{40kr^2} - (k+2)r - k - \frac{1}{4} \\
&\geqslant \frac{n}{4r} \text{ (when } n \text{ is sufficiently large).}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Step 1 can be performed successfully to find a copy of $F_{k,r}$ centered at u.

Now, let G_s be the graph obtained at some point of the iteration in Step 2 for some $s \geqslant a$. Let $x \in V_i$ be a good vertex and $j \neq i$. Then, after x becomes inactive in previous iterates, the total number of removed edges that x sends to V_j are at most $\deg_{G_a[V_i]}(x)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
e_{G_s}(x, V_j) &\geqslant t_2 - 2k - \deg_{G_a[V_i]}(x) \\
&\geqslant t_2 - 2k - \deg_{G[V_i]}(x) \\
&\geqslant t_2 - 2k - t_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Wlog, suppose that $v_1^1w_1^1, ..., v_1^kw_1^k$ is a matching in V_1. Then $v_1^1, w_1^1, ..., v_1^k, w_1^k$ are good. Let $X = \{v_1^1, w_1^1, ..., v_1^k, w_1^k\}$. By CLaim 5, the number of common active good neighbors of X in V_2 of G_s, denoted by $L_2(X)$, is at least

$$\begin{aligned}
|L_2(X)| &= \sum_{x\in X} e_{G_s}(x, V_2) - (2k-1)|V_2| - 32kr^3\gamma n - 8kr^5\gamma n \\
&\geqslant 2k(t_2 - 2k - t_1) - (2k-1)(\frac{n}{r-1} + 2\sqrt{\gamma}n) - 32kr^3\gamma n - 8kr^5\gamma n \\
&= \frac{n}{r-1} - 2[2k(r-2)-1]\sqrt{\gamma}n - 6kt_1 - 4k(k+1) - 32kr^3\gamma n - 8kr^5\gamma n \\
&\geqslant \frac{n}{r-1} - \frac{n}{2r^2} - 4k(k+1) \\
&\geq \frac{n}{r} \text{ (when } n \text{ is sufficiently large).}
\end{aligned}$$

Choose such a common neighbor u of X in V_2.

Now, suppose that we have found active and good vertices $v_i^1, ..., v_i^k$, for $i \in [3, \ell]$ $(2 \leqslant \ell \leqslant r-2)$ such that for every $j \in [1, k]$, $G_s[v_1^j, w_1^j, u, v_3^j, ..., v_\ell^j]$ is a copy of $K_{\ell+1}$.

Let $Y_j = \{v_1^j, w_1^j, u, v_3^j, ..., v_\ell^j\}$ for $j \in [1,k]$ and denote the the common active and good neighbors of Y_j in $V_{\ell+1}$ of G_s by $L_{\ell+1}(Y_j)$. Then the same reason as before,

$$\begin{aligned}
|L_{\ell+1}(Y_j)| &\geq \sum_{x\in Y_j} e_{G_s}(x, V_{\ell+1}) - \ell\cdot|V_{\ell+1}| - 32kr^3\gamma n - 8kr^5\gamma n \\
&\geqslant (\ell+1)(t_2 - 2k - t_1) - \ell(\frac{n}{r-1} + 2\sqrt{\gamma}n) - 32kr^3\gamma n - 8kr^5\gamma n \\
&= \frac{n}{r-1} - 2[(r-2)(\ell+1)-1]\sqrt{\gamma}n - 3(\ell+1)t_1 - 32kr^3\gamma n \\
&\quad -8kr^5\gamma n - 2(\ell+1)(k+1) \\
&\geqslant \frac{n}{r-1} - 2((r-2)(r-1)-1)\sqrt{\gamma}n - 3(r-1)t_1 - 32kr^3\gamma n \\
&\quad -8kr^5\gamma n - 2(r-1)(k+1) \\
&\geqslant \frac{n}{r-1} - \frac{3n}{8kr^2} - 2(r-1)(k+1) \\
&\geq \frac{n}{r} \quad \text{(when } n \text{ is sufficiently large).}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence k different active and good common neighbors $v_{\ell+1}^1, \cdots, v_{\ell+1}^k$ with $v_{\ell+1}^j \in L_{\ell+1}(Y_j)$ for $j \in [1,k]$ do exist and therefore Step 2 can be successfully iterated.

Case 2. $m \leqslant m_1$.

For every $i \in [1, r-1]$, let $B_i \subset V_i$ be the set of isolated vertices of $G[V_i]$ and $A_i = V_i \setminus B_i$. Then $|A_i| \leqslant 2m \leqslant 2m_1$. Since $|V_i| \geqslant \frac{n}{r-1} - 2\sqrt{\gamma}n > 2m_1 \geq |A_i|$, we have $B_i \neq \emptyset$. Note that, for $u \in B_i$, $\deg_{G[V_i]}(u) = 0$. By $\lfloor \frac{r-2}{r-1}n \rfloor \leqslant \deg_G(u) \leqslant n - |V_i|$, we have $|V_i| \leqslant \lceil \frac{n}{r-1} \rceil$. Together with $|V_1| + ... + |V_{r-1}| = n$, we have the following claim.

Claim 6. *For every $i \in [1, r-1]$, $\lceil \frac{n}{r-1} \rceil - (r-2) \leqslant |V_i| \leqslant \lceil \frac{n}{r-1} \rceil$. Particularly, if $(r-1)|n$, then $|V_i| = \frac{n}{r-1}$ for each $i \in [1, r-1]$.*

Since $e(G) \geqslant \phi(G, F_{k,r}) \geqslant \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r})$, there exists some integer $s \geqslant 0$, such that

$$s(e(F_{k,r}) - 1) \leqslant e(G) - \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r}) < (s+1)(e(F_{k,r}) - 1).$$

Note that $e(G) - \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r}) \leqslant m - g(k) \leqslant m_1 - g(k)$. Hence $s \leqslant \frac{m_1 - g(k)}{e(F_{k,r})-1}$. Furthermore, we have a simple and useful upper bound for s as follows.

Claim 7. $s < \frac{(r-2)(k-1)}{2} + 1$. *Particularly,* $s < e(F_{k,r})$.

Proof. For convenience, write $e = e(F_{k,r}) = \frac{kr(r-1)}{2}$ and $g = g(k)$. Since $s \leqslant \frac{m_1-g}{e-1}$, it's sufficient to prove $1 + \frac{(r-2)(k-1)}{2} > \frac{m_1-g}{e-1}$. Note that $m_1 = \frac{(e-1)(r-1)k(k-1)-kg}{e-k-1}$. So

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{(r-2)(k-1)}{2} + 1 > \frac{m_1 - g}{e-1} \\
\Leftrightarrow \quad & \frac{(r-2)(k-1)}{2} + 1 > \frac{(r-1)k(k-1) - g}{e-k-1} \\
\Leftrightarrow \quad & \frac{(r-2)(k-1)}{2} + 1 > \frac{(r-1)k(k-1) - k(k-3/2)}{e-k-1} \text{ (since } g \geq k(k-3/2)) \\
\Leftrightarrow \quad & \frac{(r-2)(k-1)}{2} + 1 > \frac{(r-2)k(k-1) + k/2}{e-k-1} \\
\Leftrightarrow \quad & [(r-2)(k-1)+2](e-k-1) - 2(r-2)k(k-1) - k > 0 \\
\Leftrightarrow \quad & (r-2)(k-1)(e-3k-1) + 2e - 3k - 2 > 0
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $e = \frac{kr(r-1)}{2} \geq 3k$ ($r \geq 3$) and the equality holds if and only if $r = 3$. It is an easy task to check that the above inequality always holds for $k \geq 1$.

Clearly, $\frac{kr(r-1)}{2} > \frac{(r-2)(k-1)}{2} + 1$ when $r \geq 3$ and $k \geq 1$. So $s < e(F_{k,r})$. □

If we can find $s+1$ edge-disjoint copies of $F_{k,r}$ in G, then we have

$$\phi(G, F_{k,r}) \leqslant e(G) - (s+1)(e(F_{k,r}) - 1) < \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r}),$$

a contradiction with the assumption that $\phi(G, F_{k,r}) \geq \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r})$. So to complete the proof of Case 2 (and the proof of Theorem 3), it remains to prove the following claim.

Claim 8. *G contains $s+1$ edge-disjoint copies of $F_{k,r}$.*

Before we prove Claim 8, we need an auxiliary claim.

Claim 9. *For every $i \in [1, r-1]$, and any subset $A^i \subset A_i$, if $A^i \neq \emptyset$ and $|A^i| \leqslant (k+1)(s+1)$, then for every $j \neq i$, there exists a subset $B^j \subset B_j$ with $|B^j| = (k+1)(s+1)$ such that G contains a complete $(r-1)$-partite subgraph of G with partitions A^i, B^j ($j \in [1, r-1]$ and $j \neq i$).*

Proof. Wlog, let $A^1 \subset A_1$ and $|A^1| = (k+1)(s+1)$. Suppose that we have found $B^2, ..., B^\ell$, $B^j \subset B_j$ with $|B^j| = (k+1)(s+1)$, $j \in [2, \ell]$, $\ell \in [1, r-2]$, such that G contains a complete ℓ-partite subgraph with partitions A^1 and $B^2, ..., B^\ell$. Note that

$|V_i| \leq \lceil \frac{n}{r-1} \rceil$ $(i \in [1, r-1])$ by Claim 6. Hence for any $u \in A^1$ and $v \in B^j$,

$$\begin{aligned} e_G(u, V_{\ell+1}) &\geqslant \delta(G) - (r-3)(\frac{n}{r-1}+1) - |A_1| \\ &\geqslant \frac{n}{r-1} - (r-2) - 2m_1, \\ e_G(v, V_{\ell+1}) &\geqslant \delta(G) - (r-3)(\frac{n}{r-1}+1) \\ &\geqslant \frac{n}{r-1} - (r-2) - 2m_1. \end{aligned}$$

Let $Z^\ell = A^1 \cup B^2 \cup ... \cup B^\ell$ and let $L_{\ell+1}(Z^\ell)$ be the set of common neighbors of Z^ℓ in $B_{\ell+1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |L_{\ell+1}(Z^\ell)| &\geq \sum_{v \in Z^\ell} e_G(v, V_{\ell+1}) - [(k+1)(s+1)\ell - 1]|V_{\ell+1}| - |A_{\ell+1}| \\ &\geqslant (k+1)(s+1)\ell[\frac{n}{r-1} - (r-2) - 2m_1] \\ &\quad -[(k+1)(s+1)\ell - 1](\frac{n}{r-1}+1) - 2m_1 \\ &= \frac{n}{r-1} - (2m_1 + r - 1)(k+1)(s+1)\ell - 2m_1 + 1 \\ &\geqslant \frac{n}{r} \ \text{(when } n \text{ is sufficiently large).} \end{aligned}$$

Hence we always can choose $B^{\ell+1} \subset B_{\ell+1}$ for $\ell \in [1, r-2]$ and so the result follows. □

Proof of Claim 8: By Claim 7, $s < e(F_{k,r})$. By $e(G) \geqslant \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r}) + s(e(F_{k,r}) - 1)$, we have

$$e(G) - (s-1)e(F_{k,r}) \geqslant \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r}) + e(F_{k,r}) - s > \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r}).$$

So, G contains s edge-disjoint copies of $F_{k,r}$. Let G' be a subgraph of G by removing the edges of s copies of $F_{k,r}$. If there is a vertex u in G' with $\deg_{G'}(u) \leqslant \lfloor \frac{r-2}{r-1} n \rfloor - s$, then

$$\begin{aligned} e(G'-u) &= e(G') - \deg_{G'}(u) \\ &= e(G) - s \cdot e(F_{k,r}) - \deg_{G'}(u) \\ &\geqslant \mathrm{ex}(n, F_{k,r}) - \left\lfloor \frac{r-2}{r-1} n \right\rfloor \\ &= \mathrm{ex}(n-1, F_{k,r}). \end{aligned}$$

If the equality does not hold or the equality holds but we can show that $G'-u$ is not an extremal graph for $F_{k,r}$, then $G'-u$ contains a copy of $F_{k,r}$ and we are done.

In the following, we show that how to remove the edges of s copies of $F_{k,r}$ in G to get our desired subgraph G' and vertex u according to three cases.

(I). If there are s vertices $u_1, ..., u_s \in A_1 \cup ... \cup A_{r-1}$ such that $\deg_{G[A_i]}(u_j) \geqslant k+s-1$ for $u_j \in A_i$. Let $q = \max\{|\{u_1, ..., u_s\} \cap A_i| : i \in [1, r-1]\}$. Then $s \geqslant q \geqslant \lceil \frac{s}{r-1} \rceil$. Wlog, assume that $u_1, ..., u_q \in A_1$. For each $j \in [1, q]$, choose k neighbors of u_j in $A_1 \setminus \{u_1, ..., u_q\}$, say $v_{j1}, ..., v_{jk}$, this is possible since there are at least $k+s-1-(q-1) = k+s-q \geqslant k$ such neighbors. We further assume that $v_{j,1} \neq v_{\ell,1}$ for $1 \leqslant j < \ell \leqslant q$. Let $A_j^1 = \{u_j, v_{j1}, ..., v_{jk}\}$ for $j \in [1, q]$. Then $|\cup_{j=1}^q A_j^1| \leq q(k+1)$. By Claim 9, we can find a common neighbor $u \in B_{i_0}$ of $\cup_{j=1}^q A_j^1$ for some $i_0 \neq 1$, here i_0 will be determined later. For each $j \in [1, q]$, since $|A_j^1| = k+1$, by Claim 9, we can choose $B_j^i \subset B_i$ for $i \in [2, r-1]$ such that

- (a) $|B_j^i| = k$,
- (b) $B_j^{i_0} \cap B_\ell^{i_0} = \{u\}$ for $j, \ell \in [1, q]$ and $j \neq \ell$,
- (c) $B_j^i \cap B_\ell^i = \emptyset$ for $i \geqslant 2$, $i \neq i_0$ and $j \neq \ell$,
- (d) G contains a complete $(r-1)$-partite graph with partitions $A_j^1, B_j^2, ..., B_j^{r-1}$.

Assume $B_j^i = \{u_{j1}^i, ..., u_{jk}^i\}$ and $u_{j1}^{i_0} = u$ for every $j \in [1, q]$ and $i \in [2, r-1]$. Then for every $j \in [1, q]$ and every $\ell \in [1, k]$, $G_{j\ell} = G[u_j, v_{j\ell}, u_{j\ell}^2, ..., u_{j\ell}^{r-1}]$ is a copy of K_r and thus $G_j = G_{j1} \cup ... \cup G_{jk}$ contains a copy of $F_{k,r}$ centered at u_j. Furthermore, $G_1, ..., G_q$ are q edge-disjoint copies of $F_{k,r}$ with a common vertex u. Let G' be the subgraph obtained from G by deleting the edges of $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_q$ and any other $s-q$ copies of $F_{k,r}$ in G.

(I.1). If $q \geqslant \lceil \frac{s}{r-1} \rceil + 1$, then

$$\deg_{G'}(u) \leqslant n - |V_{i_0}| - (r-1)q \leqslant \left\lfloor \frac{r-2}{r-1} n \right\rfloor - s - 1 < \left\lfloor \frac{r-2}{r-1} n \right\rfloor - s,$$

the second inequality holds since $|V_{i_0}| \geq \lceil \frac{n}{r-1} \rceil - (r-2)$ by Claim 6. Hence u is the desired vertex and we are done.

(I.2). $q = \lceil \frac{s}{r-1} \rceil$, let $s \equiv t \mod (r-1)$, $(t \in [0, r-2])$.

If $t = 0$ or $t \geqslant 2$, then at least two subsets of $A_1, \ldots, A_{r-1}$ satisfying that $|\{u_1, \ldots, u_s\} \cap A_i| = q$ by the choice of q. By Claim 6, at least one of V_i, $i \in [1, r-1]$ with $|V_i| = \lceil \frac{n}{r-1} \rceil$. Hence we can choose V_1 and $i_0 \neq 1$ such that $|V_1| \leq \lceil \frac{n}{r-1} \rceil$ and $|V_{i_0}| = \lceil \frac{n}{r-1} \rceil$. So,

$$\deg_{G'}(u) \leqslant n - \left\lceil \frac{n}{r-1} \right\rceil - (r-1)q \leqslant \left\lfloor \frac{r-2}{r-1} n \right\rfloor - s.$$

Here we need to show that $G'-u$ is not an extremal graph for $F_{k,r}$. Let $H=G'-u$. Consider $u_{12}^{i_0}\in V(H)$. Then $\deg_H(u_{12}^{i_0})\leq n-\lceil\frac{n}{r-1}\rceil-(r-1)<\lfloor\frac{r-2}{r-1}(n-1)\rfloor$. By Lemma 5, H is not an extremal graph on $n-1$ vertices for $F_{k,r}$ and hence we are done.

If $t=1$, then $q=\frac{s-1}{r-1}+1$. Choose i_0 such that $|V_{i_0}|=\max\limits_{\ell\in[2,r-1]}|V_\ell|$. Then $|V_{i_0}|\geqslant\lfloor\frac{n}{r-1}\rfloor$, otherwise, by Claim 6, $|V_1|+...+|V_{r-1}|\leqslant\lceil\frac{n}{r-1}\rceil+(r-2)(\lfloor\frac{n}{r-1}\rfloor-1)<n$. Hence, by Claim 6,

$$\deg_{G'}(u)\leqslant n-\left\lfloor\frac{n}{r-1}\right\rfloor-(r-1)q=\left\lfloor\frac{r-2}{r-1}n\right\rfloor-s-(r-1)<\left\lfloor\frac{r-2}{r-1}n\right\rfloor-s.$$

So we are done in this case.

(II). Suppose that G contains a copy of $F_{qk,r}$ with center $u\in A_1\cup...\cup A_{r-1}$ and $q\geqslant 2$. We choose u so that q is maximum. If $q\geqslant s+1$ then we are done since $F_{qk,r}$ contains $s+1$ edge-disjoint copies of $F_{k,r}$. So $q\leqslant s$. Then we must have $\deg_G(u)<n-\big(\lceil\frac{n}{r-1}\rceil-(r-2)\big)+(q+1)k$, otherwise, $\deg_{G[A_i]}(u)\geq(q+1)k$ for some $i\in[1,r-1]$ with $u\in A_i$, then Claim 9 guarantees that there exists a copy of $F_{(q+1)k,r}$ centered at u in G, contradicting the choice of q. Let G' be the graph obtained from G by deleting the edges of the copy of $F_{qk,r}$ and the edges of any further $s-q$ copies of $F_{k,r}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\deg_{G'}(u) &\leqslant n-\left(\left\lceil\frac{n}{r-1}\right\rceil-(r-2)\right)+(q+1)k-1-(r-1)qk\\
&= \left\lfloor\frac{r-2}{r-1}n\right\rfloor+(r-3)-((r-2)q-1)k\\
&\leqslant \left\lfloor\frac{r-2}{r-1}n\right\rfloor+(r-3)-(2r-5)k\ \ (\text{since } q\geq 2)\\
&= \left\lfloor\frac{r-2}{r-1}n\right\rfloor-\left\lceil\frac{(r-2)(k-1)}{2}+1\right\rceil-\frac{(r-2)(k-1)}{2}-(r-3)k\\
&< \left\lfloor\frac{r-2}{r-1}n\right\rfloor-s\ \ (\text{since } s<\tfrac{(r-2)(k-1)}{2}+1 \text{ by Claim 7}).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence u is the desired vertex and we are done.

(III). Now, suppose that **(I)** and **(II)** do not hold. We obtain G' from G by deleting the edges of any s copies of $F_{k,r}$. If there is a copy centered at $u\in B_1\cup...\cup B_{r-1}$,

then, by Claim 6,

$$\begin{aligned}\deg_{G'}(u) &\leqslant n-\left(\left\lceil\frac{n}{r-1}\right\rceil-(r-2)\right)-(r-1)k\\ &= \left\lfloor\frac{r-2}{r-1}n\right\rfloor-(r-1)(k-1)-1\\ &< \left\lfloor\frac{r-2}{r-1}n\right\rfloor-s \ \ (\text{since } s<\tfrac{(r-2)(k-1)}{2}+1 \text{ by Claim 7}).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, all the centers of the s copies of $F_{k,r}$ lie in $A_1\cup ...\cup A_{r-1}$. By **(II)**, they must be pairwisely distinct. By **(I)**, at most $s-1$ of them have degree at least $k+s-1$ in $G[A_i]$, $i\in[1,r-1]$. Hence, at least one of the centers, say $u\in A_i$ with $\deg_{G[A_i]}(u)\leqslant k+s-2$. By Claim 6 and $s<\frac{(r-2)(k-1)}{2}+1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\deg_{G'}(u) &\leqslant n-\left(\left\lceil\frac{n}{r-1}\right\rceil-(r-2)\right)+k+s-2-(r-1)k\\ &= \left\lfloor\frac{r-2}{r-1}n\right\rfloor-(r-2)(k-1)+s-2\\ &< \left\lfloor\frac{r-2}{r-1}n\right\rfloor-s.\end{aligned}$$

Hence u is a desired vertex in G' and we are done.

This completes the proof of Claim 8 and also completes the proof of Theorem 3.

Acknowledgement. We would like to thank Professor Jie Ma for many helpful comments and suggestions.

References

[1] P. Allen, J, Böttcher, and Y. Person, An improved error term for minimum H-decompotions of graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, **108** 92–101, 2014.

[2] B. Bollobás, On complete subgraphs of different orders, *Math. Proc. Cambridge. Philos. Soc.* **79(1)** (1976) 19–24.

[3] V. Chavátal, D. Hanson, Degrees and matchings, *J. Combin. Theory Ser.B*, **20(2)** (1976) 128–138.

[4] G. Chen, R. J. Gould, F. Pfender, and B. Wei, Extremal graphs for intersecting cliques, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **89** (2003) 159–171.

[5] P. Erdös, A. W. Goodman, L. Pósa, The representation of a graph by set intersections, *Canad. J. Math.* **18**(1966) 106–112.

[6] H. Liu, T. Sousa, Decompositions of Graphs into Fans and Single Edges, manuscript.

[7] L. Özkahya and Y. Person, Minimum H-decomposition of graphs: edge-critical case, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, **102(3)** 715–725, 2012.

[8] O. Pikhurko and T. Sousa, Minimum H-decompositions of graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser.B*, **97(6)** (2007) 1041–1055.

[9] T. Sousa, Decompositions of graphs into 5-cycles and other small graphs, *Electron. J. Combin.,* 12:Research Paper 49, 7 pp. (electronic), 2005.

[10] T. Sousa, Decompositions of graphs into cycles of length seven and single edges, *Ars Combin.,* to appear.

[11] T. Sousa, Decompositions of graphs into a given clique-extension, *Ars Combin.,* **100** 465–472, 2011.